

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/816,138	SALMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2432	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Venkat Perungavoor.

(2) James Salter(Req No. 35668).

**Date of Interview:** 1 July 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*35 USC 101*

Claims discussed:

*Claim 13, 55, and 75*

Prior art documents discussed:

*N/A*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** after Non-Final response from the Applicants

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The method claims 13,55,75 was discussed for possible 35 USC 101 Bilski type rejection. And also the computer-readable medium claims includes carrier waves and signals see Spec Pg 25 Ln 29-31. The Examiner indicated an opening for Examiner Amendment to resolve this issues..